UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/826,897	04/16/2004	Ravi Sundaram	03-4024	2220

32127   7590   10/09/2009

VERIZON LEGAL DEPARTMENT
PATENT MANAGEMENT GROUP
1320 N. COURTHOUSE ROAD
9TH FLOOR
ARLINGTON, VA 22201-2525

EXAMINER
PYZOCHA, MICHAEL J

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2437	

NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
10/09/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patents@VERIZON.COM

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _02 September 2009_.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1-54_ is/are pending in the application.
    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) _1-54_ is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   Claims 1-54 are pending.

2.   A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this

application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set

forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action

has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on

09/02/2009 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
> forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
> the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
> invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
> Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4.   Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 21, 22, 30, 31, 39 and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

as being unpatentable over Cooley (US 20030055979) in view of Jinmei et al. (US

20050076139), Yip et al. (US 6980550) and further in view of Liston (US 20040103314).

        As per claims 1, 21, 30, and 39, Cooley discloses receiving a request from a user

to obtain an address (see paragraph [0018] and Abstract); obtaining said address;

obtaining a substitute return address corresponding to said address, said substitute

return address corresponding to a used one of a block of addresses (see paragraphs

[0018] and [0021]); returning said substitute return address to said user (see paragraph

[0018] and Abstract).

Cooley fails to explicitly disclose generating a substitute return address, applying

a function to the address to obtain said substitute return address and monitoring access

to said address; and detecting an unauthorized attempt to access said address when an

attempted address corresponds to an unused one of said block of substitute addresses.

However, Jinmei et al. teaches generating a substitute return address (see

paragraph [0015]), Yip et al. teaches applying a function to a requested address to

obtain a substitute return address (see Yip et al. column 3 lines 41-48 and lines 55-67)

and Liston teaches receiving requests to obtain an address, obtaining the address (see

paragraphs [0038] and [0039]), monitoring accesses to the address and detecting

unauthorized attempts when the request corresponds to an unused address (see

paragraph [0031]).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary

skill in the art to substitute the address generating method of Cooley and Jinmei et al.

with the one of Yip et al. and to use the monitoring of Liston in the Cooley system.

Motivation to do so would have been to prevent the exposure of the privacy of

the communication host or the user to danger (see Jinmei et al. Abstract), to provide

load balancing (see Yip et al. column 2 lines 55-67) and to provide intrusion detection

and countermeasures (see Liston paragraphs [0012]-[0017]).

As per claims 2, 22, 31, and 40, the modified Cooley, Jinmei et al., Yip et al. and

Liston system discloses hashing a user address of said user to obtain one value of the

range of values mapping to said block of substitute addresses, said one value

designating said used one of said block of substitute addresses (see Yip et al. column 3

lines 41-48 and 55-67).

As per claims 4-6, the modified Cooley, Jinmei et al., Yip et al. and Liston system

discloses tracing a user when said attempted address corresponds to said unused one

of said block of substitute addresses (see Liston paragraphs [0038]-[0041]); blocking

additional unauthorized attempts when said attempted address corresponds to said

unused one of said block of substitute addresses (see Liston paragraphs [0038]-[0042]);

and wherein unused ones of said block of substitute addresses corresponds to attack

detectors (see Liston paragraphs [0038]-[0044]).

5.   Claims 3 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

the modified Cooley, Jinmei et al., Yip et al. and Liston system as applied to claims 1

and 2 above, and further in view of Hamzy et al. (US 6941368).

As per claims 3 and 7, the modified Cooley, Jinmei et al., Yip et al. and Liston

system fails to disclose hashing the time of a request as a part of the function.

However, Hamzy et al. teaches hashing a user address, destination address and

time (see column 6 lines 42-49).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary

skill in the art to include a time with the hash of the modified Cooley, Jinmei et al., Yip et

al. and Liston system.

Motivation to do so would have been to only allow a resource (i.e. address) to be

accessed during a certain time period (see Hamzy et al. column 6 lines 42-63).

6.   Claims 8-11, 13-20, 23-26, 28, 29, 32-35, 37, 38, 41-45 and 47-54 are rejected

under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the modified Cooley, Jinmei et al.,

Yip et al. and Liston system as applied to claims 1, 21, 30 and 39 above, and further in

view of Chari et al. (US 20040019781).

As per claims 8-11, 25, 26, 29, 34, 35, 38, 44, and 45 the modified Cooley,

Jinmei et al., Yip et al. and Liston system tem fails to explicitly disclose changing said

used one of said block substitute addresses over time.

However, Chari et al. teaches changing on of the used addresses over time (see

Chari et al. paragraphs [0013], [0050], [0058]).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary

skill in the art to change the used substitute addresses of the modified Cooley, Jinmei et

al., Yip et al. and Liston system.

Motivation to do so would have been to update the addresses during an attack to

invalidate addresses used in the attack (see Chari et al. paragraphs [0057]-[0058]).

As per claims 13-20, 23, 24, 28, 32, 33, 37, 41-43, and 47-54, the modified

Cooley, Jinmei et al., Yip et al., Liston and Chari et al. system discloses tracing a user

when said attempted address corresponds to said unused one of said block of

addresses (see Liston paragraphs [0038]-[0041]); blocking additional unauthorized

attempts when said attempted address corresponds to said unused one of said block of

addresses (see Liston paragraphs [0038]-[0042]); and wherein unused ones of said

block of addresses corresponds to attack detectors (see Liston paragraphs [0038]-

[0044]).

7.   Claims 12, 27, 36 and 46 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over the modified Cooley, Jinmei et al., Yip et al., Liston and Chari et al.

system as applied to claims 8, 25, 34, and 44 above, and further in view of Griffiths et

al. (US 6286045).

As per claims 12, 27, 36, and 46 the modified Cooley, Jinmei et al., Yip et al.,

Liston and Chari et al. system fails to explicitly disclose randomly choosing an address.

However, Griffiths et al. teaches randomly choosing an IP address (see column

23 lines 47-49).

At the time of the invention it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary

skill in the art to randomly choose an address in the modified Cooley, Jinmei et al., Yip

et al., Liston and Chari et al. system.

Motivation to do so would have been to determine round trip times (see column

23 lines 44-51).

Response to Arguments

8.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-54 have been considered but are

moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to MICHAEL PYZOCHA whose telephone number is

(571)272-3875. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 7:00am -

4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Emmanuel Moise can be reached on (571) 272-3865. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Michael Pyzocha/
Examiner, Art Unit 2437